EXHIBIT C

5

1 I think it would be very important -- Mr. Canizales 2 worked on a statement with Ms. Madrigal, my co-counsel, and I 3 think it's important to hear what he has to say about this. 4 On just one point, the government makes the --5 argues that general deterrence is important here and, you 6 know, I think that that's -- that it is important, but 7 Mr. Canizales-Ramirez did try -- I think he got caught up in 8 a -- in some illegal activity here but he wasn't -- I don't think he came into this country with the idea of committing 9 10 crimes, and I think that his past history evidences that he's 11 a strong, hard worker trying to help out his family. 12 He's going to be sent back to Mexico. I'm not sure 1.3 that a more significant sentence to achieve the goals of 14 general deterrence is going to have that effect, given the 15 fact that he's going to be deported to Mexico, given the fact 16 that I don't know that this sentence is going to be heard in 17 And that's basically my assessment. Mexico. 18 If Your Honor has any questions, I'm happy to 19 answer. 20 THE COURT: No. 21 Does the government want to say anything before I 22 hear from Mr. Canizales-Ramirez? 23 MR. SRINIVASAN: Yes, Your Honor, just briefly. 24 On the point that Mr. Creizman made about how the 25 defendant is to be deported anyway to Mexico, I think the

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

implication of what I'm hearing is that somehow deportation is a penalty and that should be, you know, factored in.

And I don't think that's the right way to look at this, Your Honor. I don't mean it in terms of legally that removal proceedings are civil and this is criminal. I don't mean that in a technical sense.

As set forth in the PSR, the defendant came to this country. He was deported, and he's now subject to an order of deportation that happened in 2012. So removal and the possibility of removal, were table stakes for this defendant. And after that happened in 2012, he came here and engaged in this criminal conduct.

So I think that it's important for this serious criminal conduct to have its own independent assessment, regardless of the possibility of removal for this defendant.

THE COURT: Well, it's also not like he was a permanent resident who had real strong ties to this country and now has to leave. He never had a right to be here to begin with.

MR. SRINIVASAN: That's correct, Your Honor. That's exactly right.

I think also on the point about general deterrence that Mr. Creizman was making, and I briefly want to make two points before we rest on our submission.

I think the first is that it's important to note

•

1 that this is not the first time the defendant did this.

2 During the safety valve proffer, he admitted to us that there

3 | were multiple times in which he's been involved in this kind

4 of activity where he's kind of the conduit for the drugs to

5 pass through Columbus.

So it's not just he got caught up in something, he made a mistake, he was looking to make a little bit of money. This has become part of his lifestyle, and part of the way that he was funding his business, funding his lifestyle. I think that he was at one point trying to open a club called Club Dimante in Columbus, using it to fund that. So this was becoming a core part what he was doing in Columbus.

And finally, Judge, on this general deterrence point, I think that, as much as anyone, I think we AUSAs are guilty of treating these cases somewhat abstractly. We talk about kilos, kilograms, months without really, I think, breaking down what the impact of this kind of conduct is, and I think that's important for Your Honor to consider.

A kilogram of heroin, it's a thousand grams of heroin. A typical dose of heroin is maybe a tenth of a gram, two tenths of a gram. We're talking thousands, if not tens of thousands of doses, of heroin coming into the New York area in part because of this man's conduct here. Heroin that would not come without people like him transporting it, either from the southwest or through transshipment points in places like

1 Columbus.

And as Your Honor well knows, we set forth in our sentencing submission, the opioid crisis in this country is real. We are thousands of people dying. We just heard the other day the statistics for 2016 that there were over 60,000 people who died. Not all from heroin, of course, but heroine's a big part of that.

THE COURT: Well, people, if I'm correct, the distinction is the pills, the OxyContin, oxycodone leads to heroin and then the people are not as true heroin addicts and they overdose on heroin.

MR. SRINIVASAN: Absolutely, Your Honor. That's exactly right.

And the preliminary statistics for 2017, they indicate that that number increases to over 70,000. This is a real problem that has a human face that is somewhat, we think of it sometimes as downstream from the conduct of people like the defendant.

But I think he's just as morally culpable for his role in this crisis and what it's doing to American communities. I think that a significant sentence, Your Honor, one within the guidelines range, should take that into account.

And if the Court has any other questions, I'm happy to address them.

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

I mean

THE COURT: Well, one thing, and I have to ask you, Mr. Creizman. The Probation Department suggests he has the ability to pay a fine.

MR. CREIZMAN: The answer's yes, Your Honor.

based on the analysis of his assets, it seems that he does.

And I don't -- and I would add that I don't believe, my

understanding, is that these assets are not solely or, you

know, largely due to narcotics activity but, of course, I mean
I don't know, I can't be a witness to that, I only know what
the evidence is before me.

But I would say that just in response to -- just to clarify one argument that I made. I wasn't arguing that his deportation is an extra penalty on him, my argument is essentially that in terms of general deterrence, I think that -- number one, I think that perhaps specific deterrence is important because he needs to know not to be able to come back to the country and commit crimes.

In terms of general deterrence, to put the opioid crisis, while extraordinarily serious, just -- I mean there's so many people like Mr. Canizales-Ramirez who are intermediaries who are traffickers, but I mean there's -- this is a very systemic problem and to impose a much higher sentence or a significantly higher sentence on Mr. Canizales-Ramirez solely because of his involvement in the distribution of heroin, I think is somewhat unfair as, you

in the United States over the last few years, I worked really

I do want to say that during the occasions I resided

24

25

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

hard at lawful jobs so that I could make a living and send money back home to Mexico.

My conduct that resulted in my arrest in this case is not representative of my hard work in the United States.

My decision to become involved in this drug trafficking was a terrible and unnecessary decision for which I will never forgive myself.

I thank you for listening to my comments and I beg that you exhibit leniency in sentencing me -- in my sentence.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. You can be seated.

I have obviously read the presentence report, considered the government's letter, the defendant's letter, and the statements here.

Procedurally I have calculated the guideline range, which is 63 to 70 months. I, of course, recognize that I'm not required to impose a sentence within that guideline range, but looking at the range and both most importantly the significant considerations that are set forth in 3553 of Title 18, I believe that a sentence within that guideline range is one that is appropriate in this case. And so let me just address some of those considerations.

MR. SRINIVASAN: Your Honor, I'm sorry, I think you said 63 to 70 months.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, 70 -- I misspoke, it's 78

months. Correct, I misspoke. Thank you.

1.3

But turning to those considerations. One is the seriousness of the offense, and I think it goes without saying that heroin distribution in this country, the receipt and distribution of heroin, which the defendant is charged and has admitted his guilt, is a very, very, very serious offense.

The sentence has to promote respect for the law and provide just punishment. I have considered the need for deterrence, both specific deterrence to this defendant to have him understand that this type of conduct is met with significant penalties, and also while I think general deterrence here is a consideration as well.

I have also taken into account sentences imposed on people similarly situated to Mr. Canizales-Ramirez, as well as his own history and characteristics.

So having taken all of that into account, it's the sentence of this Court that Mr. Canizales-Ramirez is committed to the custody of Bureau of Prisons for a period of 68 months to be followed by a three-year term of supervised release.

I'll impose a special assessment of \$100.

It is not disputed here that the defendant is capable of paying any fine, so I'm going to impose a fine of \$2,000 payable at a rate of \$25 per quarter while in the Bureau of Prisons, and 10 percent of his gross monthly income while on supervised release.

Case 1:16-cr-00658-CBA Document 87-3 Filed 06/28/19 Page 14 of 16 PageID #: 474

don't know if that facility is appropriate.

25

Case 1	:16-cr-00658-CBA Document 87-3 Filed 06/28/19 Page 16 of 16 PageID #: 476
	PROCEEDINGS 15
1	MR. SRINIVASAN: Fine, Your Honor.
2	We move to dismiss Counts One and Two of the
3	indictment.
4	THE COURT: The application is granted.
5	MR. SRINIVASAN: Thank you.
6	
7	(Whereupon, the matter was concluded.)
8	
9	* * * *
10	
11	
12	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
13	
14	s/ Linda D. Danelczyk January 7, 2019
15	LINDA D. DANELCZYK DATE
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	